

It is my understanding that in order for non-Baby Bells (and the like) to compete with the Baby Bells for consumer services, specifically for ADSL products, that line sharing not be disrupted. We have paid, under state mandated monopolies, for the phone lines over and over again. The Baby Bells continue to drag their feet when it comes to providing broadband services to homes at reasonable cost. Let me site you a perfect example:

I live in Chatsworth, California. About three years ago, Time Warner came in, laid fiber, and brought broadband into our homes. PacBell, did nothing until recently, long after the market was well saturated by cable modems. In the meantime, the neighboring area of Woodland Hills, California, remains without broadband of any kind (Adelphia is the cable carrier). My point here is that PacBell spent their resources where they would do the least good and had the least change of profit -- but where there was competition. The area that has no competition, remains without braodband.

If PacBell says they are losing money, it is because they didn't do their homework or they want to continue to provide high-cost (and profit) broadband (T1 and frame relay) as long as possible or both.

I am a stockholder in all the Baby Bells, holding on to everything resulting from the ATT breakup so this is, to some extend, against my own interests, but I cannot simply sit back and watch my friends continue to be without broadband because of political instead of practical or technological issues.

Thank you.